DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 475 UD 028 229

AUTHOR Davidson, Mary E.; And Others
TITLE Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's Monitoring Project CANAL: Second Quarter Progress Report of Year 2 (December 1, 1989 to February 28, 1990).
INSTITUTION Chicago Public Schools, IL. Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation.
PUB DATE May 90
NOTE 77p.; For a complete set of Commission Reports, see UD 028 213-233.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Budgets; Community Control; Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Development; *Participant Characteristics; *Participative Decision Making; Program Evaluation; *School Based Management; *School Community Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Project CANAL

ABSTRACT

This evaluation analyzes the composition and participation of the core planning teams of Project Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL), part of a court-mandated desegregation plan in Chicago (Illinois). The report covers activities during the second quarter of CANAL's second year. CANAL's goal is to organize and train core planning teams to engage in shared decision-making and to develop organizational structures that incorporate the community in the organizational and educational processes of the schools. The teams were to be composed of parents, teachers, principals, ancillary school staff, and community members. The following findings are presented: (1) the underrepresentation of students, ancillaries, parents, and especially community members persisted; (2) problems of participation in training also persisted, and the groups that were inadequately represented on the teams were least likely to attend training sessions; (3) given the inadequate participation in training, the sessions appeared to be rather traditional inservice programs for teachers; (4) the problems with the team composition and the participation in training were exacerbated by the failure of the CANAL staff to develop strategies for resolution; and (5) the CANAL staff has not developed strategies for dealing with potential duplication of effort and conflict between the core planning teams and the local school councils. Statistical data are presented in 16 tables. A description of the monitoring commission staff, a chronological list of training activities, and a budget are appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336475

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL

SECOND QUARTER PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2 (December 1, 1989 to February 28, 1990)

May 1990

Submitted to the United States Department of Education

. Mary E. Davidson
Principal Investigator

. Donn F. Bailey
. Commission Chairperson

. Ted D. Kimbrough
General Superintendent of Schools
Chicago Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Chicago Public Schools Monitoring Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 028 229

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Donn F. Bailey, Chairperson

Nancy M. Abbate	Jesse Miller
Maxine Duster	Uthman Muhammad
Mari Fohrman	Donnell Peterson
Carlos Heredia	George Riddick
Gwendolyn Laroche	Aida Sanchez
Henry Martinez	Darthula Young

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Mary E. Davidson

COMMISSION STAFF

Barbara Anglin

Helen Jackson

Barb Leebens-Osilaja

Christy Spears

Ana Tapia

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation
1819 West Pershing Road
6th Floor East
Chicago, Illinois 60609
(312) 890-8220

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION'S

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL:

SECOND QUARTER PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2
(December 1, 1989 to February 28, 1990)

Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator
Norman R. Kurtz, Primary Consultant

May 1990

Prepared under the direction of
Mary E. Davidson, Principal Investigator,
Monitoring Commission for
Desegregation Implementation
Chicago Public Schools
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT v

INTRODUCTION 1

COMPOSITION OF CORE PLANNING TEAMS
SECOND QUARTER: YEAR 2 2

- Introduction 2
- Representation of Key Constituencies 3
- Turnover on Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2 22
- Representation of LSCs on Core Teams 27
- Summary 30

PARTICIPATION IN YEAR 2 TRAINING 30

- Introduction 30
- Total Site Training 31
- Day 3 Training 46
- Summary 57

SUMMARY 57

APPENDICES 59

LIST OF TABLES

Composition of Core Planning Teams: Year 2

Table 1 - Composition of the 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 2 4

Table 2 - Changes in the Composition of the Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2 (Differences in Team Memberships Reported in November 1989 and March 1990) 5

Table 3 - Composition of the 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 2 Differences in Membership Reported in November 1989 and those Reported in March 1990 11

Table 4 - Changes in the Composition of the Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2 12

Table 5 - Change in Representation of Key Constituencies 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2 19

Table 6 - Comparison of the 41 Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2 (Ancillary Staff, Parents, and Community Members) 21

Table 7 - Turnover in the 41 Core Planning Teams Year 1 to Year 2 23

Table 8 - Percentage Turnover: Year 1 to Year 2 (Differences in November and March Lists) 24

Table 9 - Composition of the 41 Core Planning Teams Percentage of New Members in Year 2 (A Comparison of the November and March Lists) 26

Table 10 - Representation of LSC Members on the 41 Core Planning Teams
(Continuing and New Members: Year 2) 28

Table 11 - Core Planning Team Attendance at Total Site Training
(Attending, Absent and Non-CPT Present) 32

Table 12 - Number and Percentage of CPT and Non-CPT
Attending Total Site Training:
November 1, 1989 to February 8, 1990 41

Table 13 - Total Site Training Attendance
(CPT and Non-CPT Present) 44

Table 14 - Core Planning Team Attendance at Day 3
(Attending, Absent and Non-CPT Present) 47

Table 15 - Number and Percentage of CPT and Non-CPT
Attending Day 3 Training:
February 13, 1990 to February 27, 1990 54

Table 16 - Total Site Training Attendance
(CPT and Non-CPT Present) 56

May 1990

AN EXECUTIVE ABSTRACT

Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL
SECOND QUARTER PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2
(December 1, 1989 to February 28, 1990)

The progress report provides an update of changes in the composition of the core planning teams (CPTs) in each of the 41 Chicago public schools participating in Project CANAL. The report also analyzes the participation of core team members in the various CANAL training activities during the second quarter of Year 2 (December 1, 1989 through February 28, 1990).

The problems of the composition and participation of the CPTs noted for Year 1 and the first quarter of Year 2 by the Monitoring Commission persisted in the second quarter of Year 2:

o **CORE PLANNING TEAM COMPOSITION**

- Teachers continued to dominate the CPTs, while the representation of ancillary staff, parents and community members did not improve.

- Teachers on the CPTs increased from 496 to 535 (51.6 percent in Year 1 to 52.3 percent in Year 2).

- Parent members declined from 203 to 195 (21.1 percent to 19.1 percent).

- Community members increased slightly from 42 to 58 (4.4 percent to 5.7 percent), but the numbers were too few to make any difference.

- As in Year 1, those most likely to be absent from the CPTs were community members.

o **A NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS CONTINUING FROM YEAR 1 TO YEAR**

- The many changes in CPT membership from Year 1 to Year 2 meant that many teams had to integrate a relatively large number of new members in Year 2:

  -- 26.2 percent of the teachers left the core planning teams;

  -- more than one third of the ancillaries were replaced;

  -- more than 60 percent of the parents left; and

  -- more than 70 percent of community representatives left teams.

- **NEW CORE PLANNING TEAM MEMBERS IN YEAR 2**
  - About 40 percent (411) of CPT members were new in Year 2.
  - 31.6 percent of the teachers were new in Year 2.
  - 35.0 percent of the ancillaries were new.
  - 59.0 percent of the parents were new.
  - 79.3 percent of the community members were new.
- **LOCAL SCHOOL COUNCILS**
  - 21.3 percent of the CPT members also were elected to an LSC.
  - 50 of 535 teachers were on LSCs.
  - 22 of 58 community representatives were on LSCs.
  - 102 of 195 parents were elected to LSCs.
- **YEAR 2: TOTAL SITE TRAINING**
  - The failing commitment of principals, noted in the first quarter of Year 2, continued in the second quarter. Only 22 of 42 attended total site training sessions for their own schools.
  - Teachers had the best overall attendance record yet, more than a third (39.2 percent) were absent from total site training.
  - As many as 59 percent of the ancillaries on CPTs were absent.
  - Parents were even less likely to attend than ancillaries. Almost 70 percent of those on CPTs were absent from training, suggesting an insignificant role on the CPTs.
- **YEAR 2: DAY 3 TRAINING**
  - Principals' apathy continued in Day 3 training with as many as 22 of the 40 principals from CANAL schools absent. (One school did not participate in Day 3 training).
  - Of the 190 parents on CPTs, only 43 came to Day 3 training. Thus, more than 77 percent were absent.
  - Only 52 of 183 ancillaries on CPTs attended Day 3 training. Thus, 131 or more than 73 percent failed to come.

o **SUMMARY**

- Problems of team composition and attendance, identified by the Monitoring Commission by the end of the first year of CANAL, continued unresolved by the middle of Year 2.

- The issue of team composition failed to improve. Major problems of representation across the categories of students, ancillaries, parents and especially community members persisted. There was no evidence of any serious effort by CANAL staff to address the problem.

- Problems of participation in CANAL training also persisted. The groups that were inadequately represented on the CPTs were least likely to attend training sessions.

- Given the inadequate participation in training, the sessions appeared to be rather traditional inservice programs for teachers.

- CANAL staff's problems with CPT composition and participation in training were exacerbated by its failure to develop strategies for resolution.

- In addition, CANAL has not developed strategies for dealing with the potential duplication of effort and conflict between the CPTs and the LSCs in local schools.

OTHER CANAL REPORTS

Monitoring Commission's Monitoring Project CANAL: First Quarter Report of Year 2 (1989-90), January 1990, 1-58.

Monitoring Commission's Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1 (1988-89) - An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of the Core Planning Teams, January 1990, 1-59.

Monitoring Commission's Analysis of the Level of Compliance of Project CANAL's School Improvement Plans (1989-90), January 1990, 1-64.

Monitoring Commission's Observational Analysis of Project CANAL: Year 1 (1988-89), January 1990, 1-79.

Monitoring Commission's Quarterly Progress Report on Monitoring Project CANAL, August 1989, 1-140.

Monitoring Commission's Progress Report for the United States Department of Education on Monitoring Project CANAL, February 1989, 1-239.

The 67-page progress report has been submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. Reference copies are available for review at the Commission, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

MONITORING PROJECT CANAL:

SECOND QUARTER PROGRESS REPORT OF YEAR 2
(December 1, 1989 to February 28, 1990)

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the implementation of CANAL during the second quarter, December 1989, January and February 1990, of Year 2 of CANAL. In as much as the core planning teams (CPTs) of CANAL are the organizational entities that represent the implementation of school-based management to CANAL schools, continued review of the composition of and participation in CANAL activities by CPTs is important.

Project CANAL was based on the assumption that the greatest potential for improving academic achievement was to develop a model of participation in school governance that included representatives of the school's primary constituencies including administrators, teachers, ancillary staff, parents, community members and in the case of high schools, students. The core planning teams of the 41 participating schools represent the implementation of the CANAL concept.

The report begins with an update of changes in the CPT's composition in each of the 41 schools participating in CANAL. The second part of the report analyzes the participation of CPT members in the various CANAL training activities during the second quarter of Year 2 from December 1, 1989 through February 1990. In order to provide entire training sequences, the analysis includes material from the first quarter of Year 2. Some of the data for the report was not received from CANAL staff until the third week of March, entailing a delay preparing the report.

COMPOSITION OF CORE PLANNING TEAMS
SECOND QUARTER: YEAR 2

Introduction

Given the problems surrounding the composition of the CPTs in Year 1[1], the continued problems of composition and the issue of turnover in the teams in the first quarter of Year 2[2], a reanalysis of their composition was undertaken for the second quarter of Year 2. The analysis observed the fact that the memberships of the local school council (LSC's), which were published as unofficial at the time of the first quarterly report of Year 2, were updated and released as official by the Chicago Public Schools by the second quarter of Year 2. The update reported here provides a more accurate assessment of LSC members who are also on CPTs.

A further confusion in the CPT memberships came about because CANAL staff provided the Monitoring Commission with two statements of CPT members for Year 2. The CPT list was sent with a memo dated November 9 and received by the Monitoring Commission on November 10, 1989. The second appeared in CANAL's Quarterly Progress Report dated November 30, 1989. While the Quarterly Progress Report was dated November 30, 1989, it was not actually released until February 26, 1990, and received by the Monitoring Commission on March 2, 1990. (In the discussion that

---

[1] Mary E. Davidson and Norman R. Kurtz, Monitoring Commission's Year-End Progress Report of Monitoring Project CANAL Year 1 (1988-89) - An Analysis of the Composition and Participation of the Core Planning Teams, Chicago: Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation, January 1990.

[2] Mary E. Davidson and Norman R. Kurtz, Monitoring Commission's Monitoring Project CANAL: First Quarter Progress Report of Year 2 (1989-1990), Chicago: Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation, January 1990.

follows, the first statement will be referred to as the November 1989 statement and the second as the March 1990 statement.) In the analysis of current CPT memberships, the March 1990 statement was used.

The confusion of the two statements on CPT memberships further was confounded because the rosters of members for individual school were dated somewhere between October 20, 1989, and November 8, 1989. These rosters that appeared in the November 1989 statement and the March 1990 statement had the same dates, but different names appeared on some of the rosters. These differences are reviewed in the discussion that follows. No explanation was provided for these differences on the two rosters. Likely the differences were either due to errors in the original statement or changes in membership which occurred between the release of the two statements.

The membership lists provided by CANAL also identified CPT members who were elected to LSCs. However, the lists did not agree with the original LSC memberships released by the Chicago Public Schools. The differences between these two also will be discussed. In the analysis of LSC members, the official lists of the Chicago Public Schools were used.

Representation of Key Constituencies

The first issue of concern was whether the key constituents of the school community were represented on the CPTs in Year 2 of CANAL. Table 1 shows the composition of the teams for all 41 CANAL schools. The Table is based on the March 1990 statement of members. Prior to analyzing the representation of key constituents on the teams, differences between the November 1989 and March 1990 statements of members are reviewed.

Table 1

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 2*

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	TOTAL
Bass	1	11		1	1	1	1	1	9	1	27
Bennett	1	12		1	1	1			7	2	25
Bradwell	1	10		1	1	1	1	1	6	3	25
Byford	1	10		1	1	1	1	1	2	1	19
Carter	1	8		1	1	1	1	1	6	2	22
Clark	1	11		1	1	1	1		6	5	27
Cooper	1	7		1	1	1	2		4	2	19
DePriest	1	10		1	1	1	1	1	4	2	22
Dett	1	6		1	1	1			5		15
DuBois	1	13		1	1	1	1		3		21
Dumas	1	16	7	1	1	1	1		4	2	34
DuSable	1	24		1	1	4	1				32
Dyett	1	16		1	1	1	1		5	2	28
Fernwood	1	11		1	1	1	2		6	3	26
Frazier	1	11		1	1		2		6	3	25
Gale	1	19		1	1	1			1	1	25
Goldblatt	1	14		1	1	1	1	1	5	2	27
Gregory	1	14		1	1	1	1		3	1	23
Guggenheim	1	10		1	1	1	1		7	3	25
Hammond	1	16			1	1	1	1	6		27
Hearst	1	10		1	1	1	1	1	3	2	21
Howe	1	13		1	1	1	2	1	5		25
Hughes	1	12		1	1	1	1		4	1	22
Jungman	1	9		1	1		1	1	3		17
Kelvyn Park	1	10	2	1	1	1		1	2	2	21
Lafayette	1	13		1	1	1	1				18
Lowell	1	13		1	1	1	1	1	7		26
Manierre	1	8		1	1	1	1	1	4	1	19
Mayo	1	10		1	1	1	1		5	1	21
Moos	1	12		1	1	1	1	1	4	3	25
Orr	1	23	1			1			2	1	29
Piccolo	1	18		1	1	1		1	5	1	29
Robeson	1	10	1		1		3		7		23
Sherman	1	15		1	1		2		4	1	25
Spencer	1	13		1	1	1	3		4		24
Stowe	1	15		1	1		1		7	2	28
Sumner	1	9		1	1	1	1		8	1	23
Terrell	1	21		1	1	1	4	2	9	2	42
Westinghouse	1	17		1	1	1	2		5	2	30
Williams	1	19			1	2	1	1	5	1	31
Woodson	1	16		1	1	1	1		7	2	30
	41	535	11	37	40	40	48	18	195	58	1023

*Information on the core planning team compositions was provided by staff of Project CANAL.

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; TOTAL=the number of members on each team.

Table 2

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

DIFFERENCES IN TEAM MEMBERSHIPS REPORTED IN NOVEMBER 1989

AND MARCH 1990

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Bass			No Differences												
Bennett															
LSC									+1n						+1
Bradwell															
Continuing		+1									+1				
New		-5										-5	-4		
Discontinued			+1											+1	
Byford															
Continuing	+1										+1				
New	-1											-1	0		
Discontinued	-1													-1	
LSC		-1c								+1n					0
Carter															
New										+2		+2	+2		
LSC										+1c-1n					0
Clark															
LSC									-2n	+2n					0
Cooper															
Continuing										+1	+1				
New										-1		-1	0		
Discontinued										-1				-1	
LSC		+1c													+1
DePriest															
Continuing		+1							+1		+2				
New		-1							-1			-2	0		
Discontinued									-1					-1	
LSC		+1c								-1n					0
Dett															
Continuing		+1									+1				
New		-1										-1	0		
Discontinued		-1												-1	

*The numbers reflect differences between the two reports. Only categories in which differences occurred are shown. Schools having no differences are so noted.

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; Be=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

Changes in ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total change in number continuing and new; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

DIFFERENCES IN TEAM MEMBERSHIPS REPORTED IN NOVEMBER 1989

AND MARCH 1990

School	P	T	S	Be	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
DuBois															
Continuing									+1		+1				
New									-1			-1	0		
Discontinued									-1					-1	
LSC									+1c-1n						0
Dumas															
New		+1										+1	+1		
DuSable															
New		+1										+1	+1		
Dyett															
Continuing		-1									-1				
New		+1										+1	0		
LSC									+1c						+1
Fernwood															
Continuing		+1									+1				
New		-1										-1	0		
Discontinued		-1												-1	
Frazier															
Discontinued		-1												-1	
LSC									-1n						-1
Gale															
Continuing		+1									+1		+1		
Discontinued		-1												-1	
LSC		+2c							-1n						+1
Goldblatt															
Continuing		+2			+1					+1	+4				
New					-1					-1		-2	+2		
Discontinued		-2			-1					-1				-4	
LSC		-1n													-1

*The numbers reflect differences between the two reports. Only categories in which differences occurred are shown. Schools having no differences are so noted.

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; Be=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

Changes in ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total change in number continuing and new; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

DIFFERENCES IN TEAM MEMBERSHIPS REPORTED IN NOVEMBER 1989

AND MARCH 1990

School	P	T	S BE LRM C TA SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Gregory										
Continuing				-1		-1				
New					+1		+1	0		
Discontinued				+1					+1	
LSC					+1n					+1
Guggenheim										
Continuing		-2				-2				
New		+2					+2	0		
Discontinued		+1							+1	
LSC		+1n		+5n	+1n					+7
Hammond										
Discontinued		+1							+1	
LSC		+1c								+1
Hearst										
Continuing	+1	+1				+2				
New	-1	-1					-2	0		
Discontinued	-1	-1							-2	
Howe										
Continuing		+2				+2				
New		-3					-3	-1		
Discontinued		-2							-2	
LSC		-1n		-1n						-2
Hughes			No Differences							
Jungman			No Differences							
Kelvyn Park			No Differences							

*The numbers reflect differences between the two reports. Only categories in which differences occurred are shown. Schools having no differences are so noted.

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; Be=building engineer; LRH=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

Changes in ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total change in number continuing and new; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

17 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

DIFFERENCES IN TEAM MEMBERSHIPS REPORTED IN NOVEMBER 1989

AND MARCH 1990

School	P	T	S	Be	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Lafayette															
LSC		+1c													+1
Lowell															
Continuing		+1									+1				
New		-1										-1	0		
Manierre															
LSC									+1n-1c						0
Mayo															
New										-1		-1	-1		
LSC									+1c-1n						0
Moos															
New		+1										+1	+1		
Orr			No Differences												
Piccolo															
New		-1										-1	-1		
LSC		-1n							-1n	+1n					-1
Robeson															
New			+1									+1	+1		
Discontinued		-1												-1	
LSC			+1n												+1
Sherman															
Continuing									+1		+1		+1		
Discontinued									-1					-1	
Spencer															
Continuing		+1									+1				
New		-2										-2	-1		
Discontinued		-1												-1	

*The numbers reflect differences between the two reports. Only categories in which differences occurred are shown. Schools having no differences are so noted.

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; Be=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

Changes in ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total change in number continuing and new; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

DIFFERENCES IN TEAM MEMBERSHIPS REPORTED IN NOVEMBER 1989

AND MARCH 1990

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Stowe															
Continuing	+1										+1				
New	-1											-1	0		
Discontinued	-1													-1	
LSC									-1n	+1n					0
Sumner															
Continuing									+1		+1				
New			-2						+1			-1	0		
Discontinued									-1					-1	
LSC									+2c						+2
Terrell															
Continuing		-1									-1				
New		+1					+2	-1				+3	+2		
LSC									-1c						-1
Westinghouse															
New			-2									-2	-2		
Discontinued					+1									+1	
LSC			-1n						+1c+1n						+1
Williams															
Continuing										-1	-1				
New										+1		+1	0		
Woodson															
Continuing		+1						-1			0		0		
Totals	0	0	-3	0	0	0	+2	-1	+2	+2	+16	-14	+2	-16	+12

*The numbers reflect differences between the two reports. Only categories in which differences occurred are shown. Schools having no differences are so noted.

P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; Be=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

Changes in ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total change in number continuing and new; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 and n=new members in year 2.

Table 2 shows the differences between the November and March statements of CPT memberships. The Table indicates that while there were a number of differences, changes in the net results were not dramatic. Thus, the number of students across all CPTs declined by three, teacher aides increased by four, school community representatives declined by three and parents and community members increased by two each.

More significant were the changes in the number of members who continued on the CPTs in Year 1 and those who discontinued into Year 2. Column ST1 in Table 2 shows that using the March 1990 statement, 16 more members continued from Year 1 to Year 2. (Column ST3 shows that there were 16 fewer members discontinued from Year 1 which corresponds to the 16 additional members shown continued in column ST1). Column ST2 shows that 14 fewer new members were added in Year 2. The overall change in membership from the November 1989 list to the March 1990 list was a net increase of two members. (There were 16 more continuing members minus 14 additional new ones for a net gain of two.) Column ST4 shows that there was an increase of 12 CPT members who were also on an LSC. The representation of LSC members on the CPTs is discussed in detail in conjunction with Table 10.

Table 3 shows the net differences across constituent groups of CPTs. Only those schools that showed a difference between the November 1989 and March 1990 statements were included in the Table. Thus, for example, the Bradwell CPT, see Table 4, shows one additional teacher continued from Year 1, but it also indicates that five fewer new teachers added for a net difference of -4 teachers, Table 3. Carter added two new community members for a net gain of two CPT members, and so on. When all the gains

Table 3

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 2*

DIFFERENCES IN MEMBERSHIP REPORTED IN NOVEMBER 1989

AND THOSE REPORTED IN MARCH 1990

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	TOTAL
Bradwell		-4									-4
Carter										+2	+2
Cooper							+1	-1			0
Dumas		+1									+1
DuSable		+1									+1
Fernwood							+1	-1			0
Gale		+1									+1
Goldblatt		+2									+2
Gregory									-1	+1	0
Howe		-1									-1
Mayo										-1	-1
Moos		+1									+1
Piccolo		-1									-1
Robeson			+1								+1
Sherman									+1		+1
Spencer		-1									-1
Sumner			-2						+2		0
Terrell							+2				+2
Westinghouse			-2								-2
Woodson		+1						-1			0
TOTALS		0	-3				+4	-3	+2	+2	+2

* Only the 20 CANAL schools showing differences in membership between the two reports are displayed in the table. The remaining 21 schools showed no differences. The table is read as follows: Bradwell showed 4 fewer teachers on the CPT in the March 1990 report than in November 1989 for a net change of -4. Carter showed 2 more community members for a net change of +2, and so on.

P=principal; T=teachers; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; c=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR= parent; CM=community member.

Table 4

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2 *

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Bass															
Continuing	1	10		1	1	1	1		5	1	21				
New		1						1	4			6	27		
Discontinued		1							4					5	
LSC	1c	1c							2c	2n					6
Bennett															
Continuing	1	10				1			2	1	15				
New		2		1	1				5	1		10	25		
Discontinued		1		1	1				4					7	
LSC	1c	2c							1c	1n	1c	1n			7
Bradwell															
Continuing	1	1			1	1	1	1	2		8				
New		9		1					4	3		17	25		
Discontinued		11		1		1	1	1	5	1				21	
LSC	1c	2n							2c	4n					9
Byford															
Continuing	1	8			1		1		1		12				
New		2		1		1		1	1	1		7	19		
Discontinued		3		1					2					6	
LSC	1c								1c	1n	1n				4
Carter															
Continuing	1	8		1	1		1	1	2		15				
New						1			4	2		7	22		
Discontinued		4				1	1		7					13	
LSC	1c	1c							2c	3n					7
Clark															
Continuing		8		1	1		1			2	13				
New	1	3				1			6	3		14	27		
Discontinued	1	2				1			5					9	
LSC	1n	1c							4n	2n					8
Cooper															
Continuing	1	6		1	1		1		2	1	13				
New		1				1	1		2	1		6	19		
Discontinued						1	1		1	1				4	
LSC	1c	2c							1c	1n					5

*P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 1; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 or n=new members in year 2.

Table 4 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2 *

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
DePriest															
Continuing	1	9		1	1	1	1	1	3		18				
New		1							1	2		4	22		
Discontinued		2							2					4	
LSC	1c	2c							2c	1n					6
Dett															
Continuing	1	6			1	1			4		13				
New				1					1			2	15		
Discontinued				1										1	
LSC	1c								4c						5
DuBois															
Continuing	1	9			1	1			1		13				
New		4		1			1		2			8	21		
Discontinued		5		1			1		1	1				9	
LSC	1c	2c							1c2n						6
Dumas															
Continuing	1	10			1	1			1		14				
New		6	7	1			1		3	2		20	34		
Discontinued		4		1			1		4	1				11	
LSC	1c	2c							1c1n						5
DuSable															
Continuing	1	21									22				
New		3		1	1	4	1					10	32		
Discontinued		12												12	
LSC	1c	2c													3
Dyett															
Continuing	1	13		1	1		1		2	1	20				
New		3				1			3	1		8	28		
Discontinued						1			3					4	
LSC	1c	2c							2c2n						7
Fernwood															
Continuing	1	9		1	1	1	2		3		18				
New		2							3	3		8	26		
Discontinued									2					2	
LSC	1c	2c							2c3n	2n					10

*P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 or n=new members in year 2.

Table 4 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Frazier															
Continuing	1	6			1						8				
New		5		1			2		6	3		17	25		
Discontinued		8		1			1	1	4	2				17	
LSC	1c								3n						4
Gale															
Continuing	1	14				1					16				
New		5		1	1				1	1		9	25		
Discontinued		2		1	1		1		3					8	
LSC	1c	2c								1n					4
Goldblatt															
Continuing	1	10		1	1	1	1		2	1	18				
New		4						1	3	1		9	27		
Discontinued		3								1				4	
LSC	1c								2c1n						4
Gregory															
Continuing	1	7		1	1		1		2		13				
New		7				1			1	1		10	23		
Discontinued		1				1			5					7	
LSC	1c	1c1n							1c	1n					5
Guggenheim															
Continuing	1	7				1	1				10				
New		3		1	1				7	3		15	25		
Discontinued		1		1	1				5					8	
LSC	1c	1c1n							5n	2n					10
Hammond															
Continuing		9			1	1	1	1	1		14				
New	1	7							5			13	27		
Discontinued	1	2		1					5					9	
LSC	1n	2c							1c						4
Hearst															
Continuing	1	8				1	1	1	1		13				
New		2		1	1				2	2		8	21		
Discontinued		1		1	1		2		3	1				9	
LSC	1c	1c							1c1n						4

* P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 or n=new members in year 2.

Table 4 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Howe															
Continuing		11		1	1	1	2	1	3		20				
New	1	2							2			5	25		
Discontinued	1	5							2					8	
LSC	1n	1c							1c						3
Hughes															
Continuing	1	9		1	1		1		2	1	16				
New		3				1			2			6	22		
Discontinued		2				1								3	
LSC	1c	2c							1c2n	1c					7
Jungman															
Continuing	1	8						1	3		13				
New		1		1	1		1					4	17		
Discontinued		1							2	1				4	
LSC	1c								1c						2
Kelvyn Park															
Continuing		2		1	1			1	1	1	7				
New	1	8	2			1			1	1		14	21		
Discontinued	1	11				1	1		7	2				23	
LSC	1n	1n	1n												3
Lafayette															
Continuing	1	10			1	1					13				
New		3		1			1					5	18		
Discontinued		5				1			6	1				13	
LSC	1c	1c													2
Lowell															
Continuing	1	11				1	1	1	7		22				
New		2		1	1							4	26		
Discontinued		3		1	1									5	
LSC	1c	1c							1c						3
Manierre															
Continuing	1	5		1		1	1	1	3	1	14				
New		3			1				1			5	19		
Discontinued					1				4	2				7	
LSC	1c	2n							1c						4

* P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 or n=new members in year 2.

Table 4 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2 *

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Mayo															
Continuing	1	7			1	1	1		3		14				
New		3		1					2	1		7	21		
Discontinued		1		1					1	3				6	
LSC	1c								1c2n						4
Moos															
Continuing	1	7			1	1	1		1		12				
New		5		1				1	3	3		13	25		
Discontinued		3		1					5	2				11	
LSC	1c								1c1n	1n					4
Orr															
Continuing	1	7							1		9				
New		16	1			1			1	1		20	29		
Discontinued									2					2	
LSC	1c	2n	1n												4
Piccolo															
Continuing	1	11		1	1	1		1			16				
New		7							5	1		13	29		
Discontinued		8				1	2	2	1	2				16	
LSC	1c	1c							1n	1n					4
Robeson															
Continuing	1	10					3		2		16				
New			1		1				5			7	23		
Discontinued		1		1	1				4					7	
LSC	1c		1n						1c1n						4
Sherman															
Continuing	1	6			1		1		4		13				
New		9		1			1			1		12	25		
Discontinued		1		1					2					4	
LSC	1c	1c							3c	1n					6
Spencer															
Continuing	1	9			1	1	1		1		14				
New		4		1			2		3			10	24		
Discontinued		3		1					2					6	
LSC	1c	1n							1c2n						5

*P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 or n=new members in year 2.

Table 4 continued

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2*

School	P	T	S	BE	LRM	C	TA	SCR	PAR	CM	ST1	ST2	TOT	ST3	ST4
Stowe															
Continuing	1	5			1		1		2		10				
New		10		1					5	2		18	28		
Discontinued		14		1		1			2					18	
LSC	1c	1c1n							1c4n	2n					10
Sumner															
Continuing	1	7				1	1		4		14				
New		2		1	1				4	1		9	23		
Discontinued		1							4	2				7	
LSC	1c	1c							3c2n	1n					8
Terrell															
Continuing	1	16		1	1	1	2	2	3	2	29				
New		5					2		6			13	42		
Discontinued		1							4	1				6	
LSC	1c	1c							1c1n						4
Westinghouse															
Continuing		11		1		1	2		1		16				
New	1	6			1				4	2		14	30		
Discontinued	1	1			1	1		1	2	1				8	
LSC	1n								1c1n						3
Williams															
Continuing		12				2	1	1	4		20				
New	1	7			1				1	1		11	31		
Discontinued	1	6		1	1			1	7	7				24	
LSC	1n	1n							2c						4
Woodson															
Continuing	1	13			1	1			1		17				
New		3		1			1		6	2		13	30		
Discontinued				1			1		5					7	
LSC	1c	1c1n							6n	2n					11
TOTALS	41	535	11	37	40	40	48	18	195	58	612	411	1023	355	218

*P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; BE=building engineer; LRM=lunch room manager; C=clerk; TA=teacher aide; SCR=school community representative; PAR=parent; CM=community member; LSC=members elected to the Local School Council.

ST1=number continuing from year 1; ST2=new members in year 2; TOT=total of continuing and new members; ST3=number of members discontinued from year 1; ST4=number of year 2 on LSC.

The lower case c and n in the rows of LSC refer to Local School Council members who are c=continuing from year 1 or n=new members in year 2.

and losses for the schools were added up, the net difference was an increase of two members across all of the CPTs.

Table 4 provides a detailed description of changes in team memberships from Year 1 to Year 2. The CPT for Year 2 for each school is described in terms of members continuing from Year 1, new members added in Year 2, number of members discontinued, and CPT members who also were elected to the LSC. LSC members are further described as to whether they were on the team in Year 1 or were new to the team in Year 2.

The 41 teams had a total of 1,023 members (see the column labeled TOT on the last page of Table 4). Of the 1,023, 612 were members who continued from Year 1 (see column ST1), and 411 were new to the teams in Year 2 (see column ST2). Column ST3 shows that 355 members were discontinued from Year 1 and column ST4 indicates that 218 of the 1,023 members also were elected to an LSC.

The 411 new members represented added costs to CANAL in bringing them up to the level of continuing members who had the benefit of a whole year of training. They also represented an added cost in terms of integrating them into the existing teams. The 355 discontinued members represented a loss in terms of the effort expended on their training and their absence from the teams of which they had been a part. In the discussion that follows, major changes and the extent of turnover on the CPTs are discussed in greater detail.

Table 5 shows the changes in the representation of key constituencies from Year 1 to Year 2. In brief, changes in membership in Year 2 did not improve the underrepresentation on CPTs of ancillaries, parents and community members. The

Table 5

CHANGE IN REPRESENTATION OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES
41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2

Category Of Constituent	Members In Year 1		Members In Year 2	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Principals	41	4.3	41	4.0
Teachers	496	51.6	535	52.3
Ancillaries*	179	18.6	183	17.9
Parents	203	21.1	195	19.0
Community Members	42	4.4	58	5.7
Students	-	-	11	1.1
	961**	100.0	1023	100.0

*Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

**Data provided by CANAL indicated 2 more ancillaries and 8 fewer community members for year 1 than they showed originally for year 1.

principal of each CANAL school was by definition a member of the CPT, so there are 41 principals on the teams. The number of teachers on the 41 teams increased slightly, from 496 members to 535. Teachers also increased in terms of the percentage of all CPT members from 51.6 in Year 1 to 52.3 in Year 2. In the Year 1 analysis of CANAL, the issue of teacher dominance on the CPTs was raised. The increase of teachers in Year 2 exacerbates the potential of such dominance.

Both the number and percentage of parents declined slightly in Year 2 from 203 to 195 or from 21.1 percent to 19 percent. While community members showed a gain over Year 1, increasing from 42 to 58 members, the number of community members was still too small to have meaningful input to the CPTs.

Table 6 confirms that Year 2 changes in membership did not have a notable effect on the adequacy of representations of ancillaries, parents and community members. As Table 6 shows, ancillaries met the minimum of at least three members on a team in Year 2 in all cases except one, and that team had one ancillary. In Year 1, four teams had less than three ancillaries. As many as 31 teams had no less than four parents in Year 2. In Year 1, only 29 teams had at least four parents. Ten teams still had three or fewer parents in Year 2, while that was true for 12 teams in Year 1. As in Year 1, those most likely to be absent from the CPTs were community members. Only 19 teams had two or more community members in Year 2, while as many as 10 teams had no members from the community.

The data show that problems of appropriate representation of the school constituencies required in the original CANAL Proposal, that plagued the implementation of CANAL in Year 1, continued to do so in Year 2. Small improvements took place,

Table 6

COMPARISON OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2
ANCILLARY STAFF, PARENTS, AND COMMUNITY MEMBERS

Category Of Constituent	Number Of Constituents On The Team									
	0		1		2		3		4 or more	
	Year		Year		Year		Year		Year	
	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Ancillary Staff*	2	0	1	1	1	0	5	4	32	36
Parents	2	2	1	1	3	3	6	4	29	31
Community Members	17	10	11	12	7	13	4	5	2	1

* Ancillary staff include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks teacher aides, and school community representatives

but by the middle of the second year of CANAL, many teams still failed to meet the expectations of the original proposal.

Turnover on Core Planning Teams: Year 1 to Year 2

Given the changes in continuing, new and discontinued members shown in the March 1990 statement, the extent of turnover on the teams noted in the Commission's first quarterly report for Year 2 was updated. The March 1990 statement showed less turnover in the CPTs than did the November 1989 list of CPT members.

Table 7, using the data on members provided in the March 1990 statement, shows how turnover affected the categories of constituents on the CPTs. Principals were most likely to continue, with only six new principals in Year 2. Teachers showed a turnover of more than 26 percent of their members. In the case of ancillaries, more than a third were replaced. But, the greatest turnover was among parents and community members, with more than 60 percent and 70 percent respectively, leaving the teams after one year of participation.

Table 7 also shows the number and percentage of new members added to the teams in Year 2. The percentage of new members follows the pattern that might be expected given the discontinuing members. Thus, six new principals were added to replace the six who left (in the case of principals, the parallel of discontinuing and new principals is exact because each of the 41 teams have one principal on the team). In the case of teachers, 26.2 percent discontinued after Year 1, but more new teachers were added than left, so 31.6 percent of the teachers in Year 2 were new. (Note that the number of teachers on the teams increased from 496 in Year 1 to 535 in Year 2.)

Table 7 also shows that in Year 2 as many as 35 percent of the ancillaries, 59

Table 7

TURNOVER IN THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS
YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2

Category Constituent	Year 1 Total*	Continuing		Discontinued		New Members		Year 2 Total*
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Principal	41	35	85.4	6	14.6	6	14.6	41
Teachers	496	366	73.8	130	26.2	169	31.6	535
Ancillaries**	179	119	66.5	60	33.5	64	35.0	183
Parents	203	80	39.4	123	60.6	115	59.0	195
Community Members	42	12	28.6	30	71.4	46	79.3	58
	961	612	63.7	349	36.3	400	39.5	1012

* The totals for Year 1 refer to the number of individuals on the core teams in the first year. The totals for Year 2 refer to the number of team members in Year 2. Continuing refers to those who continued from Year 1 to Year 2; discontinued, to those who left the teams, and new members, those who joined in Year 2. Note that the table does not include students in that there no students on the teams in Year 1. If the 11 students who joined the teams are added to the Year 2 total above, 1012 + 11 = 1023, which is the same as the total for Year 2 members in Table 2.

**Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

Table 8

PERCENTAGE TURNOVER: YEAR 1 TO YEAR 2

DIFFERENCES IN NOVEMBER AND MARCH LISTS

Category Of Constituent	Continuing		Discontinued	
	November	March	November	March
Principals	78.0	85.4	22.0	14.6
Teachers	72.0	73.8	28.0	26.2
Ancillaries*	67.2	66.5	32.8	33.5
Parents	37.9	39.4	62.1	60.6
Community Members	22.0	28.6	78.0	71.4

*Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks; teacher aides; and school community representatives.

percent of the parents, and 79.3 percent of the community members were new. Thus, the three constituencies with the least members also had the most new members. The import is that not only did the ancillary, parent and community constituents on the team suffer the most losses from Year 1, but they had to integrate the most new members in Year 2. Given extent of their generally poor representation to begin with, the added burden of turnover will likely undermine further their capacity to make their views felt on the CPTs.

Table 8 shows the differences between the two statements by comparing the percentages of continuing and discontinued members across the two constituencies. In all cases, the percent of continuing members rose slightly while those who discontinued declined somewhat. The largest declines were for principals and community members. However, in both cases the percentages are somewhat misleading because the number of individuals involved was quite small. Thus, the November 1989 statement showed 32 principals continuing, while the March 1990 statement showed it to be 35 reducing the number of discontinuing principals from nine to six. In the case of community members, 12 continued as opposed to the original 11, while those who discontinued declined to 30 from the original 39.

Table 9 shows the number and percent of new CPT members using 20 percent intervals. It provides a better sense of the impact of turnover on the individual CPTs. The Table also compares the November 1989 and March 1990 statements. The Table shows that four rather than two CPTs had as few as 20 percent new members, 21 compared to 19 CPTs had 21 to 40 new members, 15 compared to 11 had 41 to 60 percent new members, but the same number, five CPTs had as many as 61 to 80 percent

Table 9

COMPOSITION OF THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS

PERCENTAGE OF NEW MEMBERS IN YEAR 2

A COMPARISON OF THE NOVEMBER AND MARCH LISTS

	Percentage Of New Members							
	0-20%		21-40%		41-60%		61-80%	
	Nov	Mar	Nov	Mar	Nov	Mar	Nov	Mar
Number Of Teams	2	4	19	21	15	11	5	5
Percentage Of Teams	4.9	9.8	46.3	51.2	36.3	26.8	12.2	12.2

new members. The message for Year 2 remains essentially unchanged from Year 1, a large number of teams were faced with integrating a relatively large number of new members in Year 2.

Representation of LSCs on Core Teams

An issue of considerable concern is the relationship of the CPTs created by CANAL and the elected local school councils, (LSCs), that were mandated by State law. The two bodies are similar in intent, composition and designated functions. While the CPTs existed a year prior to the election of the LSCs, the LSCs have the legal authority of a State mandate whereas the CPTs are a voluntary undertaking of the Chicago Public Schools and the 41 schools participating in CANAL.

There were differences in the composition of the two groups. The CPTs were to be composed of the principal, teachers representing various grades and programs in the schools, three ancillary staff, five parents, two community members, and in the case of high schools, students. The LSCs are made up of the principal, two teachers, six parents, two community members and in the case of high schools, one student (non-voting).

Even though the membership structures are somewhat different, given the similarity in composition and functions of the two teams, a large overlap of LSC and CPT members would be fortuitous in reducing the potential for conflict between the two groups and promoting the capacities of each to make a contribution to improving educational achievement.

Table 4 describes the CPT members who also were elected to an LSC. Table 10 shows whether the LSC members on the CPTs were continuing or new. It also shows

Table 10

REPRESENTATION OF LSC MEMBERS ON THE 41 CORE PLANNING TEAMS
CONTINUING AND NEW MEMBERS: YEAR 2

Category Of Constituent	Total Members	Continuing Members: LSC		New Members: LSC		Total LSC**	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Principals	41	35	85.4	6	14.6	41	100.0
Teachers	535	37	6.9	13	2.4	50	9.3
Ancillaries*	183	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Parents	195	46	23.6	56	28.7	102	52.3
Community Members	58	2	3.4	20	34.5	22	37.9
Students	11	0	0.0	3	27.3	3	27.3
	1023	120	11.7	98	9.6	218	21.3

*Ancillaries include building engineers, lunch room managers, clerks, teacher aides, and school community representatives.

**The percentage in the column refers to the percent of constituents on an LSC. Thus, all of the principals, or 100% were on LSCs. Fifty teachers, or 9.3% of the 535 teachers were on an LSC, and so on.

the distribution of LSC members across the constituencies of the CPTs. A total of 218 of the 1,023 core team members also were elected to an LSC. The March 1990 statement of CPT members showed 12 more LSC members than did the November 1989 statement. (Six of the 12 additions were community members, three were parents, and the remaining three were teachers.) Principals automatically were members of the LSC, leaving 177 for the other constituencies. Of the 177, 50 were teachers, 102 were parents, 22 were community members and the remaining three were students.

The relevance of the 218 LSC members is more apparent with respect to the total number of LSC members in the 41 CANAL schools. Recall that each LSC is made up of six parents, two community members, two teachers and the principal. High schools have one student who is not a voting member. Thus, each team has 11 members and high schools have 12. Given the 41 schools (36 elementary schools and five high schools), the CANAL schools had a total of 456 individuals on LSCs. Only 218 of the 456, or about 48 percent were members of CPTs. This means that 238 LSC members were not on the CPT in their school. The potential for the two groups to come to cross purposes, or simply to fail to take advantage of their joint capacity seems high.

The Monitoring Commission has emphasized the need for CANAL staff to take measures to assure cooperation between the CPTs and the LSCs. A specific example of the potential difficulty is the school improvement plan. The plan was a primary product of Year 1 for the CPTs, and the plans were to be updated by the spring of Year 2. However, under that State mandate, the LSC has the authority to approve and accept the school improvement plan. The potential for problems seems real.

Summary

Evidence on the composition of the CPTs of CANAL shows that the problems of membership, both in terms of representing the intended constituencies of the CANAL Proposal and dealing with the creation of the LSCs, have not been dealt with. Ancillaries, parents and community members continue to be underrepresented while there is no mechanism in place for dealing with the presence of the LSCs.

PARTICIPATION IN YEAR 2 TRAINING

Introduction

Appropriate CPT composition is essential for the implementation of CANAL. As the preceding shows, composition continues to be problematic in Year 2 and undermines the hope of implementing the concept around which CANAL was organized. Despite the inadequacy of the teams, CANAL staff has proceeded with training. Given the decision to go forward, the question is: Do those individuals who are on the CPTs participate in the training that is being provided by CANAL?

Review of the participation of CPT members in CANAL training activities of Year 1 and the first quarter of Year 2 revealed a low rate of participation among all constituent groups except principals and teachers.[3] While the participation of principals and teachers was high throughout the first year of CANAL, 90 percent or higher, it showed a decline in the first quarter of Year 2, especially in the case of principals. The decline in participation continued and even worsened in the second quarter of Year 2.

---

[3] op. cit., Davidson and Kurtz, Year-End Progress Report and First Quarter Report of Year 2, January 1990.

During the second quarter of Year 2, two major sequences of training took place: total site training which was to bring together the CPT with the entire school; and, Day 3 training which was designed for the CPTs.

Analysis of attendance during Year 1 and the first quarter of Year 2 of CANAL training consisted of counting the number of individuals who signed in for training. The constituent groups that they represented also was taken into account. There was concern, however, as to whether those who signed in were actually members of CPTs, or simply others from the constituent groups who came to the training sessions. Thus, an individual could have signed in as a teacher but may or may not have been a member of the CPT. The analysis provided here compares the names of those who signed in for training with the names of members of the CPTs. The goal is to monitor the extent to which CPT members actually participate in CANAL training.

Total Site Training

Total site training was intended to involve the CPT with the entire school in order to develop the skills and processes necessary to initiate school-based management and shared decision-making. The training also was intended to address priorities in the school improvement plans. Thus, attendance at total site training by members of the CPT as well as that of all the members of constituent groups in the school community was vital for implementing the school improvement plan.

Table 11 provides data on attendance at total site training. In order to provide a coherent picture of the entire sequence of total site training, the analysis begins with the first session of total site training that took place on November 1, 1989, and ends with the last session on February 8, 1990.

Table 11

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
November 1									
Sherman									
CPT Present	1	10		2	2		15		
CPT Absent		5		2	2	1		10	
Non-CPT		27		4	1				32
November 2									
Dett									
CPT Present	1	4		1	2		8		
CPT Absent		2		2	3			7	
Non-CPT		29		7					36
November 6									
Goldblatt									
CPT Present	1	11		2	3		17		
CPT Absent		3		3	2	2		10	
Non-CPT		26			7				33
November 8									
Piccolo (1 of 2)									
CPT Present		7		1	3		11		
CPT Absent	1	11		3	2	1		18	
Non-CPT		32		11	4				47
November 9									
Piccolo (2 of 2)									
CPT Present	1	10		1			12		
CPT Absent		8		3	5	1		17	
Non-CPT		34		20					54

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=non-CPT attending.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 11 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
November 10									
Hearst									
CPT Present		8		2			10		
CPT Absent	1	2		3	3	2		11	
Non-CPT		30		3	3				36
November 13									
Hammond									
CPT Present	1	16		4	3		24		
CPT Absent					3			3	
Non-CPT		26		11	1				38
November 14									
Gale									
CPT Present		17		2			19		
CPT Absent	1	2		1	1	1		6	
Non-CPT		34		6					40
November 16									
Lowell									
CPT Present	1	8		4	1		14		
CPT Absent		5		1	6			12	
Non-CPT		21		8					29
November 20									
Sumner									
CPT Present		7		4	2		13		
CPT Absent	1	2			6	1		10	
Non-CPT		15		3	2				20

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=non-CPT attending.

Table 11 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*
ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
November 21									
Gregory									
CPT Present	1	5			1		7		
CPT Absent		9		4	2	1		16	
Non-CPT		23		1	5				29
November 22									
DuBois									
CPT Present	1	9		2	1		13		
CPT Absent		4		2	2			8	
Non-CPT		11	3	2	2				18
November 27									
Cooper									
CPT Present	1	5		2			8		
CPT Absent		2		3	4	2		11	
Non-CPT		26		3					29
November 30									
Stowe									
CPT Present		9			1		10		
CPT Absent	1	6		3	6	2		18	
Non-CPT		36		4	1				41

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 11 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
December 1									
Terrell									
CPT Present	1	20		3	1		25		
CPT Absent		1		6	8	2		17	
Non-CPT		13		4	1				18
December 4									
Jungman									
CPT Present	1	8		3			12		
CPT Absent		1		1	3			5	
Non-CPT		25			1				26
December 5									
Lafayette (1 of 2)									
CPT Present		3		1			4		
CPT Absent	1	10		3				14	
Non-CPT		24		14					38
Lafayette (2 of 2)									
CPT Present	1	9		3			13		
CPT Absent		4		1				5	
Non-CPT		30		10					40
December 7									
Moos									
CPT Present		9					9		
CPT Absent	1	3		5	4	3		16	
Non-CPT		24		2					26
December 8									
Bennett									
CPT Present	1	10		3	3		17		
CPT Absent		2			4	2		8	
Non-CPT		24	7	7	4	3			45

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 11 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
December 11									
Hughes									
CPT Present		8		1	2		11		
CPT Absent	1	4		3	2	1		11	
Non-CPT		14		4	1				19
December 12									
Spencer									
CPT Present		12		2	1		15		
CPT Absent	1	1		4	3			9	
Non-CPT		32		4	3				39
December 13									
Manierre									
CPT Present	1	6		3	2		12		
CPT Absent		2		2	2	1		7	
Non-CPT		16		13	3				32
December 15									
Dumas									
CPT Present		11		1	1		13		
CPT Absent	1	5	7	3	3	2		21	
Non-CPT		26		8	1				35
December 18									
Carter									
CPT Present	1	4		3	2		10		
CPT Absent		4		2	4	2		12	
Non-CPT		31		1	1				33
December 19									
Williams (1 of 2)									
CPT Present		7		1			8		
CPT Absent	1	12		4	5	1		23	
Non-CPT		16		4					20

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; P=parent CM=community member, The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 11 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
December 20									
Williams (2 of 2)									
CPT Present		11		1			12		
CPT Absent	1	8		4	5	1		19	
Non-CPT		20		2					22
December 21									
Bass									
CPT Present	1	7		2	1		11		
CPT Absent		4		3	8	1		16	
Non-CPT		25	1	8					34
January 9									
Guggenheim									
CPT Present		10		1			11		
CPT Absent	1			3	7	3		14	
Non-CPT		15							15
January 11									
Dyett									
CPT Present		12			4		16		
CPT Absent	1	4		4	1	2		12	
Non-CPT		19			1				20
January 16									
DePriest									
CPT Present		3		1	3		7		
CPT Absent	1	7		4	1	2		15	
Non-CPT		10		3	1				14
January 17									
Frazier									
CPT Present	1	10		1	4		16		
CPT Absent		1		3	2	3		9	
Non-CPT		28		6					34

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 11 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
January 19									
Fernwood									
CPT Present	1	9		4	3		17		
CPT Absent		2		1	3	3		9	
Non-CPT		9	3	5	2				19
January 22									
Mayo									
CPT Present	1	9		2	2		14		
CPT Absent		1		2	3	1		7	
Non-CPT		23	1	8	3				35
January 23									
Woodson									
CPT Present	1	12		3	3		19		
CPT Absent		4		1	4	2		11	
Non-CPT		10	3	3	1				17
January 26									
Byford									
CPT Present		7		4	2		13		
CPT Absent	1	3		1		1		6	
Non-CPT		10			2	1			13
January 29									
Orr									
(1 of 2)									
CPT Present		7					7		
CPT Absent	1	16	1	1	2	1		22	
Non-CPT		32		1					33
January 30									
Orr									
(2 of 2)									
CPT Present		8					8		
CPT Absent	1	15	1	1	2	1		21	
Non-CPT		31							31

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 11 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT TOTAL SITE TRAINING*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
February 5									
Robeson (1 of 2)									
CPT Present	1	9		2	4		16		
CPT Absent		1	1	2	3			7	
Non-CPT		17							17
February 6									
Robeson (2 of 2)									
CPT Present	1	7		1	2		11		
CPT Absent		3	1	3	5			12	
Non-CPT		20		1					21
February 7									
Westinghouse (1 of 2)									
CPT Present		1					1		
CPT Absent	1	16		5	5	2		29	
Non-CPT		29							29
February 8									
Westinghouse (2 of 2)									
CPT Present		1					1		
CPT Absent	1	16		5	5	2		29	
Non-CPT		21		2					23
Total CPT Present							510		
Total CPT Absent								543	
Percent CPT Absent								51.7%	
Total Non-CPT Present									1230

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT present.

The information provided to the Monitoring Commission by CANAL staff indicated that only 36 schools participated in this sequence of total site training. Five schools, Bradwell, Clark, DuSable, Howe and Kelvyn Park were not shown as participating. Five other schools, including Lafayette, Orr, Piccolo, Robeson, and Williams, were trained on two different days. In the analysis of the five schools trained on two days, each is treated as an independent training event. It was assumed that because part of the total school staff attended on the first day and the remainder on the second day, the entire CPT should be present on both occasions in order to work with the staff attending on each of the two days.

The rows across Table 11 show the date on which the session was held and the school involved in the session. The rows depict also whether the attendees were members of the CPT and present at the session, members of the CPT but absent, or whether they were attendees who were not on the CPTs.

The columns of Table 11 show the constituent categories including principals, teachers, students, ancillaries, parents and community members. The columns also provide the totals of attendees including CPT members who were present, (P); CPT members who were absent, (A); and non-CPT members who attended, (N).

In that the purpose of total site training was to involve the entire school community with its CPT, the number of non-CPT members attending in all categories was expected to be quite large. That was the case for a total of 1,230 non-CPT individuals who took part in the training (see the last page of Table 11). In all cases but two, the number of non-CPT outnumbered CPT members. A glance at Table 11 shows that the great majority of the non-CPT individuals who attended the training were

Table 12

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CPT AND NON-CPT
ATTENDING TOTAL SITE TRAINING: NOVEMBER 1, 1989 TO FEBRUARY 8, 1990

Constituent	CPT Members			Non-CPT Members	
	Number Present	Number Absent	Percent Absent	Number Present	Percent Of Total Attending
Principals	22	20	47.6	n/a	n/a
Teachers	356	211	37.2	964	73.0
Students	0	11	100.0	18	100.0
Ancillaries	73	107	59.4	193	72.6
Parents	59	141	70.5	51	46.4
Community Members	0	53	100.0	4	100.0
Total	510	543	51.6	1230	70.7

teachers. And, while Table 11 doesn't show the detail, a great majority of non-CPT persons in the ancillary group were teacher aides.

Table 11 shows that a substantial number of CPT members failed to attend total site training. In 20 of the 42 sessions, the number of CPT members who were absent outnumbered those who were present. Apparently, the problems of attendance that characterized CANAL training sessions continued to be present.

Table 12 summarizes the data in Table 11. It allows a direct comparison of the total number of CPT members who were present and absent for each constituency. It also shows the percent of the CPT members who were absent from each constituency. In addition, Table 12 indicates the number of non-CPT members in attendance and the percent of the total attendance that they represent.

Only 22 of the 42 school principals attended total site training. Thus, almost half of them failed to come even though the session was explicitly designed for their school. The failing commitment of principals indicated by their declining attendance at CANAL training, continued in the second quarter of Year 2.

Teachers had the best overall attendance record of all the constituencies. But even in their case, more than a third of the teachers on the CPT, 37.2 percent were absent from the total site session. Given that the entire training session was designed around their particular school, the large proportion of absences was surprising. In combination with the poor showing of the principals, it does not bode well for CANAL. When combined with the non-CPT teachers present, teachers clearly represented the vast majority of attendees.

Students made a poor showing at the sessions. None of the 11 students on CPTs attended. The 18 students who attended were all non-CPT. Evidently, the process was promoted or structured in a fashion that did not lead to student participation.

Ancillaries also made a poor showing. As many as 59 percent of the ancillaries who were members of CPTs were absent. And, of those who were present, both CPT and non-CPT, the great majority were teacher aides. It is not clear why the participation rates were so poor for teachers and ancillaries, especially when the training was explicitly designed to involve the entire school community. Also, it should be recalled that CANAL maintains an entire cadre of teachers and ancillaries so that all of the regular staff of a school can take part in the training. Did the cadre fail to include sufficient numbers? Was the cadre of substitute staff available and were the regular teachers and ancillaries relieved from their regular duties only to fail to attend training? Whatever the answers, the priority that CANAL deserves was clearly lacking.

Parents did even worse than ancillaries with almost 70 percent of those on CPTs being absent from the training. Almost as many parents who were non-CPT attended as those who were on the CPT, 51 compared to 59. The data suggest that parents played an insignificant role in total site training.

Community members continued the non-participation that characterized their first year of training. None of the community members on CPTs came to total site training and only four non-CPT attended. If any attempt was made in Year 2 to involve community members in CANAL, there was no evidence of success from these data.

Table 13 illustrates the importance of refining the analysis of participation by comparing the names of attendees with the names of individuals who are actually on the

Table 13

TOTAL SITE TRAINING ATTENDANCE

CPT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

Constituent	Total Present	CPT Present	% Present CPT	Non-CPT Present	% Present Non-CPT
Students	18	0	0.0	18	100.0
Ancillaries	266	73	27.4	193	72.6
Parents	110	59	53.6	51	46.4
Community Members	4	0	0.0	4	100.0

CPTs. Because all of the principals were on the CPTs, and there were so many non-CPT teachers, Table 13 shows only differences related to students, ancillaries, parents and community members.

If it had been assumed that most of those who signed in as students belonged to a CPT, it would have been concluded that given 18 students attended, most of the 11 students on the CPTs attended. In fact, none of the students on the CPTs attended, and all 18 were non-CPT. Similarly, because there were 266 ancillaries present, it would be concluded that most of the 175 ancillaries on the CPTs attended the training. But as Table 13 shows, only 73 of the 266 persons attending the session were CPT members. Most of the ancillaries on CPTs, 196, failed to attend total site training.

In the case of parents, 110 attended total site training, and it would have been assumed that most of them were part of the 195 parents on CPTs. However, only 59 of the parents attending were CPT members, while 51 were not. The number of community members was so limited that whatever data are used, the end result was no meaningful participation.

Attendance at total site training by all categories of constituencies was disappointing. Almost half of the principals, more than a third of the teachers, all of the students, almost 60 percent of the ancillaries, almost 70 percent of the parents, and all of the community members were absent from the training. The high rate of absenteeism must be weighed with the fact that the training was explicitly designed to bring the CPTs together with their schools. Moreover, CANAL has invested substantial fiscal and other resources to prepare and train a cadre of teachers and ancillaries so regular staff could attend training. Yet, many failed take part.

Day 3 Training

On February 13, CANAL initiated Day 3, Year 2 training for the CPTs only. The training took place over eight sessions with as many as seven and as few as three CPTs attending a given session. All 41 CANAL schools were scheduled for training. One school, Westinghouse, was scheduled for both February 15 and February 27, Table 14. The team attended only the February 27 session. On February 22 another CPT, Guggenheim, failed to appear and there was no record that the school participated in any other of the Day 3 sessions. Presumably, the Guggenheim CPT did not take part in Day 3 training.

Day 3 training was intended to provide members of the teams with knowledge and skills necessary for them to meet their responsibilities in leading the school in school-based management and shared decision-making. Given that the sessions were designed explicitly for the CPTs, it was expected that only members of the teams would be present. That was not, however, the case.

Table 14 shows in detail who attended Day 3 training. The rows of the table show the schools receiving training on specific dates and also the number of CPT members present, absent and the number of non-CPT persons attending the session. The columns show the constituents (P=principals, T=teachers, S=students, A=ancillaries, PAR=parents and CM=community members). The table also has columns of totals that consist of P=the total number of CPT members at the session, A=the number of CPT members absent from the session, and N=non-CPT members who attended.

A comparison of the list of attendees with the list of persons on the CPTs indicated that (1) a large number of CPT members were absent from the sessions; and,

Table 14

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT DAY 3*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
February 13									
Bradwell									
CPT Present		5		3	4	3**	15		
CPT Absent	1	5		2	2			10	
Non-CPT		2		1	1				4
Byford									
CPT Present		8		1	2	1	12		
CPT Absent	1	2		4				7	
Non-CPT		1							1
Dett									
CPT Present		5			1		6		
CPT Absent	1	1		3	4			9	
Non-CPT					1				1
DuBois									
CPT Present	1	10		2	2		15		
CPT Absent		3		2	1			6	
Non-CPT				1					1
Goldblatt									
CPT Present		8					8		
CPT Absent	1	6		5	5	2		19	
Non-CPT		1							1
Sherman									
CPT Present		11		2	1	1	15		
CPT Absent	1	4		2	3			10	
Non-CPT	1**								1
February 14									
Gale									
CPT Present		19					19		
CPT Absent	1			3	1	1		6	
Non-CPT				1					1
Hammond									
CPT Present		14		2	1		17		
CPT Absent	1	2		2	5			10	
Non-CPT				2	2				4

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

**While shown as community members for Bradwell, the three signed in as parents. In Sherman, the listed principal was absent, and another person signed in as acting principal.

Table 14 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT DAY 3*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
February 14 continued									
Hearst									
CPT Present		9		2	1		12		
CPT Absent	1	1		3	2	2		9	
Non-CPT		2			1				3
Lowell									
CPT Present	1	8		2	2		13		
CPT Absent		5		3	5			13	
Non-CPT		9							9
Piccolo									
CPT Present	1	9		1			11		
CPT Absent		9		3	5	1		18	
Non-CPT		5		1	1	1			8
Sumner									
CPT Present		7			1		8		
CPT Absent	1	2		4	7	1		15	
Non-CPT		1			1				2
February 15									
DuSable									
CPT Present		10					10		
CPT Absent	1	14		7				22	
Non-CPT		4							4
Kelvyn Park									
CPT Present		2					2		
CPT Absent	1	8	2	4	2	2		19	
Non-CPT		3							3
February 20									
Cooper									
CPT Present	1	5				1	7		
CPT Absent		2		5	4	1		12	
Non-CPT					2	1			3

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 14 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT DAY 3*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
February 20 continued									
Gregory									
CPT Present	1	8					9		
CPT Absent		6		4	3	1		14	
Non-CPT									0
Jungman									
CPT Present	1	8		4			13		
CPT Absent		1			3			4	
Non-CPT		4							4
Lafayette									
CPT Present	1	10		4			15		
CPT Absent		3						3	
Non-CPT		5							5
Moos									
CPT Present		8		1			9		
CPT Absent	1	4		4	4	3		16	
Non-CPT		1							1
Stowe									
CPT Present		15		1			16		
CPT Absent	1			2	7	2		12	
Non-CPT		1							1
February 22									
Dyett									
CPT Present	1	8			3		12		
CPT Absent		8		4	2	2		16	
Non-CPT									0
Guggenheim									
CPT Present							0		
CPT Absent	1	10		4	7	3		25	
Non-CPT									0

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 14 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT DAY 3
ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
February 22 continued									
Howe									
CPT Present		11		2	1		14		
CPT Absent	1	2		4	4			11	
Non-CPT		1			1				2
Terrell									
CPT Present		13		2	1		16		
CPT Absent	1	8		7	8	2		26	
Non-CPT		1			1				2
Woodson									
CPT Present	1	12				1	14		
CPT Absent		4		4	7	1		16	
Non-CPT		1		1	2				4
February 23									
Bass									
CPT Present	1	10			1		12		
CPT Absent		1		5	8	1		15	
Non-CPT				1					1
Bennett									
CPT Present	1	9		1		1	12		
CPT Absent		3		2	7	1		13	
Non-CPT		1				1			2
DePriest									
CPT Present	1	9		3	4		17		
CPT Absent		1		2		2		5	
Non-CPT		2							2
Fernwood									
CPT Present	1	9			2		12		
CPT Absent		2		5	4	3		14	
Non-CPT									0

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the session. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 14 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT DAY 3*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
February 23 continued									
Frazier									
CPT Present	1	7		2	1		11		
CPT Absent		4		2	5	3		14	
Non-CPT				1					1
February 26									
Carter									
CPT Present		5		2	3		10		
CPT Absent	1	3		3	3	2		12	
Non-CPT		1		1	1				3
Clark									
CPT Present		6		2			8		
CPT Absent	1	5		2	6	5		19	
Non-CPT									0
Dumas									
CPT Present		9		1	2		12		
CPT Absent	1	7	7	3	2	2		22	
Non-CPT		2			4				6
Hughes									
CPT Present		7		1	2		10		
CPT Absent	1	5		3	2	1		12	
Non-CPT					1				1
Manierre									
CPT Present	1	6		3	1		11		
CPT Absent		2		2	3	1		8	
Non-CPT				1					1
Spencer									
CPT Present							0		
CPT Absent	1	13		6	4			24	
Non-CPT									0

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the sessions. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

Table 14 continued

CORE PLANNING TEAM ATTENDANCE AT DAY 3*

ATTENDING, ABSENT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

School And Date	Constituent						Total		
	P	T	S	A	PAR	CM	P	A	N
February 26 continued									
Williams									
CPT Present	1	16		2	2		21		
CPT Absent		3		3	3	1		10	
Non-CPT		2		1					3
February 27									
Orr									
CPT Present	1	13		1	1		16		
CPT Absent		10			1	1		12	
Non-CPT		2			2				4
Robeson									
CPT Present	1	9		3	4		17		
CPT Absent		1	1	1	3			6	
Non-CPT		14	1						15
Westinghouse									
CPT Present		11		2			13		
CPT Absent	1	6		3	5	2		17	
Non-CPT		3							3
Total CPT Present							470		
Total CPT Absent								531	
Percent CPT Absent								53.0%	
Total Non-CPT Present									107

*Attendance was evaluated by comparing names of attendees with those of CPT member lists. The rows show CPT members present or absent, and non-CPT attending the sessions. The columns for constituents are P=principal; T=teacher; S=student; A=ancillary; PAR=parent; CM=community member. The columns under Total are P=total CPT present; A=total CPT absent; N=total non-CPT attending.

(2) a number of individuals attended the sessions who were not CPT members. For example, on February 13, Bradwell attendees consisted of 15 CPT members and four others who were not on the CPT. And, 10 of Bradwell's CPT were absent. In some sessions, such as those held on February 14, the number of non-CPT members attending was quite high. Thus, Lowell had 13 CPT members present and 13 absent, but they were joined by another nine who were not on the CPT. At the same session, Piccolo had 11 CPT members attend with 18 members absent but eight individuals attended who were not on the CPT.

It is not clear what the role of the non-CPT attendees was in the session. Did the same individuals participate in other training activities for the team? Were they sent as replacements for CPT who weren't able to attend? What does the presence of non-team members do to the underlying concept of the "core team"? There is no discussion or provision for the role of non-CPT members in CPT training in the CANAL literature.

Table 15 summarizes the data of Table 14 across the categories of the CPT constituencies. Given that the CPTs of 40 schools participated, 40 principals should have attended the Day 3 sessions. However, as Table 14 shows, only 18 were present and 22 were absent. One additional individual signed in as substituting for the principal, but the name of the individual did not appear on the list of CPT members. More than half of the principals declined to participate, once more confirming the trend of failing interest and commitment to CANAL as evidenced by participation.

While teachers on the CPT did somewhat better in attendance, 349 out of a total of 525 members on the 40 teams were present for Day 3 training, as many as 176 absent. Thus, 33.5 percent of the teachers on CPTs failed to show up for training. In addition,

Table 15

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF CPT AND NON-CPT
ATTENDING DAY 3 TRAINING: FEBRUARY 13, 1990 TO FEBRUARY 27, 1990

Constituent	CPT Members			Non-CPT Members	
	Number Present	Number Absent	Percent Absent	Number Present	Percent Of Total Attending
Principals	18	22	55.0	1	5.3
Teachers	349	176	33.5	69	16.5
Students	0	11	100.0	1	100.0
Ancillaries	52	131	71.6	12	18.8
Parents	43	147	77.4	21	32.8
Community Members	8	49	86.0	3	27.3
	470	536	53.3	107	18.5

69 non-CPT teachers attended the sessions representing 16.5 percent of all the teachers who came. Again, the role of non-CPT members in the training was unclear. At a minimum, non-CPT attendees could confound the efforts of CPTs to develop the skills to move forward in developing a core of leadership for school management.

None of the 11 students on the 40 CPTs came for training, and in fact, only one student, a non-CPT member attended. There were a total of 179 ancillaries members on the CPTs, but only 52 of them came for training. Thus, 131, or more than 73 percent failed to come. A small number of ancillaries, 12, came who were not members of the CPTs.

Parents showed a rate of absenteeism similar to that of ancillaries. Of 190 potential CPT parents, only 43 came to Day 3 training. Thus, more than 77 percent were absent. Their absence was accompanied by the presence of 21 parents who were not on CPTs. Given that only 43 parents who were on CPTs attended, 21 non-CPT members represent a substantial proportion of parents present who were not a part of the CPT. Community members continued to play virtually no role in the process with only eight of 57 members attending.

Table 16 shows the percent of attendees who were CPT members as well as the percent of non-CPT who attended. As expected, almost 100 percent of the principals attending were CPT members in that principals are by definition members of the CPT. However, one individual did sign in as substitute principal who was not on the CPT. Of teachers attending, 83.5 percent were CPT members, ancillaries were 81.3 percent CPT, parents were 67.2 percent CPT while only 11 community members attended and eight of those were on a CPT.

Table 16

TOTAL SITE TRAINING ATTENDANCE
CPT AND NON-CPT PRESENT

Constituent	Total Present	CPT Present	% Present CPT	Non-CPT Present	% Present Non-CPT
Principals	19	18	94.7	1	5.3
Teachers	418	349	83.5	69	16.5
Students	1	0	0.0	1	100.0
Ancillaries	64	52	81.3	12	18.7
Parents	64	43	67.2	21	32.8
Community Members	11	8	72.7	3	27.3
	577	470	81.5	107	18.5

Summary

The analysis confirms the downward trend of participation in CANAL training. If only individuals who were officially members of the CPTs are counted, the number of attendees is reduced further by 18.5 percent (See Table 16). Clearly, participation in CANAL training activities involving the CPTs represents a major problem.

SUMMARY

The problems identified by the Monitoring Commission by the end of the first year of CANAL continue unresolved by the middle of the second year. The issue of team composition failed to improve. Major problems of representation across the categories of students, ancillaries, parents and especially community members persisted. There was no evidence of any dramatic effort on the part of CANAL to address the problem. In fact, the design and schedules of training activities proposed for Year 2 appear based on the assumption that properly constituted CPTs are in place and functioning.

The problems of composition were accompanied by those of participation. The very groups that were inadequately represented in CPT memberships were least likely to attend training sessions. Given the attendees at training, the sessions appeared to be rather traditional in-service training programs for teachers.

The problems of composition and participation are further complicated by the failure, on the part of CANAL, to formally recognize and develop alternative strategies for dealing with the problems. Given their schedule of activities, it is clear that they are proceeding as though the teams intended by the original proposal were functional. The

increasing number of non-CPT attendees who are showing up at CPT training suggests that the original concept of CANAL is further compromised by accepting whoever is willing and able to participate in training. Just as CANAL failed to deal with the inadequate composition of the CPTs and the non-representative participation, so has it failed to confront the reality of the LSCs. The CPTs and LSCs have largely overlapping functions and responsibilities, but the major difference is that the LSCs are invested with the authority of a State mandate, while the CPTs have no comparable authority. The potential for conflict, duplication of effort and expenditure of resources at cross-purposes is too great to be ignored.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

MONITORING COMMISSION STAFF

The Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation's principal investigator, Dr. Mary E. Davidson, is assisted by primary consultants and full-time Commission staff in monitoring Project CANAL.

Primary consultants are: Joseph E. Hill, Dr. Norman R. Kurtz and Dr. Calvin Smith, Jr. The principal investigator and primary consultants are experienced in various aspects of research.

Staff assigned in whole or in part to monitor Project CANAL are: Barbara S. Anglin, Barb Leebens-Osilaja and Christy R. Spears. Other Commission staff assisting include: Helen Jackson and Ana Tapia.

Complete resumes for the principal investigator, primary consultants and full-time Commission staff appeared in the Commission first quarterly report published in February 1989 and therefore, are not reproduced here. Mr. Hill and Mrs. Anglin's resumes were published in the first quarter, Year 2 progress report published January 1990.

Additional copies of all CANAL monitoring reports published by the Monitoring Commission are available for reference at the Comission's office, 1819 W. Pershing Road, 6th Floor East, Chicago, IL 60609.

APPENDIX B

PROJECT CANAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES AT THE TRAINING CENTER

(December 1, 1989 through February 28, 1990)

CANAL ACTIVITIES AT THE TRAINING CENTER
(December 1, 1989 through February 28, 1990)

December 1989

12/1/89	Total Site Training (Terrell School)
12/1/89	Local School Council Training*
12/4/89	Total Site Training (Jungman School)*
12/5/89	1/2 Total Site Training (Lafayette School)*
12/6/89	1/2 Total Site Training (Lafayette School)*
12/6/89	Paideia Seminar
12/6/89	High School Principals*
12/7/89	Total Site Training (Moos School)*
12/7/89	Ron Edmonds Symposium
12/8/89	Total Site Training (Bennett/Shedd School)*
12/8/89	School-based Evaluators, CPT chairs, and Process Observers
12/11/89	Total Site Training (Hughes School)*
12/12/89	Total Site Training (Spencer School)*
12/13/89	Total Site Training (Manierre School)*
12/13/89	Cross Cultural Education Symposium
12/14/89	Total Site Training (Bass School)*
12/15/89	Total Site (Dumas School)
12/18/89	Total Site Training (Carter School)*
12/19/89	Total Site Training (Williams)*
12/19/89	Parent Liaisons Workshop*
12/20/89	Total Site Training (Williams)*
12/20/89	Students' Workshop*
12/21/89	Total Site Training (Bass School)
12/21/89	Ron Edmonds Symposium
12/22/89	Instructional Cadre Training

January 1990

1/8/90	Instructional Cadre Training*
1/9/90	Total Site Training (Guggenheim School)
1/10/90	High School Chairpersons
1/10/90	High School Principals' Workshop
1/10/90	Paideia Seminar
1/11/90	Total Site Training (Dyett School)
1/11/90	Elementary Principals' Workshop
1/12/90	School-based Evaluators, CPT chairs, and Process Observers*
1/16/90	Total Site Training (DePriest School)
1/16/90	Parent Liaisons' Workshop
1/17/90	Total Site Training (Frazier School)*
1/18/90	Advisory Council Meeting
1/19/90	Total Site Training (Fernwood School)*
1/22/90	Total Site Training (Mayo School)*

CANAL TRAINING ACTIVITIES (Continued)

January 1990

1/23/90	Total Site Training (Woodson North School)
1/24/90	Total Site Training (DuSable High School)
1/25/90	Total Site Training (DuSable High School)
1/26/90	Total Site Training (Byford School)
1/29/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Orr High School)*
1/30/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Orr High School)
1/31/90	CPT Representatives' Workshop*

February 1990

2/1/90	Instructional Cadre Training*
2/5/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Robeson High School)
2/6/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Robeson High School)
2/7/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Westinghouse High School)
2/8/90	1/2 Total Site Training (Westinghouse High School)*
2/9/90	School-based Evaluators, CPT chairs, and Process Observers*
2/13/90	Day 3 CPT Training (DuBois, Bradwell, Sherman, Dett, Goldblatt and Byford schools)
2/13/90	Parents Liaisons' Workshop
2/14/90	Day 3 CPT Training (Piccolo, Gale, Hammond, Hearst, Lowell and Sumner schools)
2/14/90	Model Cluster Principals' Workshop
2/15/90	Engineers and Lunchroom Managers' Workshop*
2/16/90	Day 3 CPT Training (Clark, Mayo, Frazier, Fernwood, DePriest, and Bennett/Shedd schools)
2/20/90	Day 3 CPT Training (Stowe, Cooper, Jungman, Lafayette, Moos, and Gregory schools)
2/21/90	Students' Workshop*
2/22/90	Day 3 CPT Training (Dyett, Howe, Terrell, and Woodson North schools)*
2/23/90	Instructional Cadre Training
2/26/90	Day 3 CPT Training (Bass, Dumas, Carter, Williams, Manierre, and Hughes schools)
2/27/90	Day 3 CPT Training (Orr, Robeson and Westinghouse schools)*
2/28/90	Total Site Training (Bennett/Shedd)

* Activities monitored by the Monitoring Commission for Desegregation Implementation

APPENDIX C

BUDGET STATUS

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

PROJECT CANAL

SECOND YEAR

OPERATING EXPENSES	Second Year Budget	Encumbrances/ Expenses 02/28/90	Balance As of 02/90
Supplies	$ 3,300	$ 628	$ 2,672
Postage	5,000	1,360	3,640
Consultant Services	127,000	100,039	26,961
Printing	5,000	3,857	1,143
Travel	20,000	9,484	10,516
Furniture/Equipment	14,000	1,709	12,291
Total Operating Expenses	**$174,300**	**$117,077**	**$57,223**

MONITORING COMMISSION FOR DESEGREGATION IMPLEMENTATION

PROJECT CANAL
Second Year Budget Detail as of 02/28/90

General Office Supplies		$ 628
Postage		1,360
Consultant Services as of 02/28/90:		
Expended	$63,057	
Encumbered	36,982	
Total Expenditures/Encumbrances		100,039
Printing:		
Mailing Labels	$ 990	
Flyers	308	
Project CANAL Reports	2,559	
Total Printing		3,857
Travel Expenses:		
Hotel	$ 4,257	
Auto Mileage	124	
Food	974	
Airfare	3,181	
Local	701	
Miscellaneous	247	
Total Travel		9,484
Furniture/Equipment:		
File Cabinets	$ 956	
Dictaphone	324	
Service Contract	429	
Total Furniture/Equipment		1,709
Total Operating Expenses		$ 117,077